leaders in our country is not an ordinary thing. It is a very, very serious thing and the Ministry must immediately intervene in the matter and find out telephonicaly from the Collector of Coimbatore as to who put up the posters. I want the Ministry to act immediately. The posters of Mao Tse Tung and Chou En Lai will not be tolerated in Tamilnad.

மாண்புமிகு திரு. இரா. நெடுஞ்செழியன் : தலைவர் அவர்களே, இது அவசர முக்கியத்துவம் வாய்ந்ததாக இருந்தாலும், சட்டப்படி நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுக்க காவல் துறையினர் இருக்கிறார்கள். சட்டத்திற்கு மீறி இது நடந்திருக்குமானால், முறைப்படி நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்வார்கள். அதற்காக இந்தச் சபை நடவடிக்கையை ஒத்திவைத்து விவாதிக்க வேண்டிய அவசியம் இல்லை என்று தெரிவித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.

மாண்புமிகு பேரவைத் துணைத் தலைவர் : எங்காவது தவறு நடந்தால், அதைத் திருத்துவதற்கு அரசாங்கத்திடம் பாதுகாப்புகள் இருக்கின்றன. இது அன்றாட நிகழ்ச்சியாகும். இதற்காக சபை நிகழ்ச்சியை ஒத்திவைக்கத் தேவையில்லை என்ற காரணத்தினால், இதற்கு அனுமதி மறுக்கிறேன்.

அடுத்து பேரவை விதி 41-இன் கீழ் திரு. எஸ். இராமச்சந்திரன் அவர்கள் அவசரப் பொதுமுக்கியம் வாய்ந்த—கவன ஈர்ப்புத் தீர்மானம் கொண்டு வருவார்கள்.

4. கவன ஈர்ப்பு

அத்தியாவசிய உணவுப் பண்டங்களின் விலைகளைக் கட்டுப்படுத்தல்.

திரு. எஸ். இராமச்சந்திரன் : பேரவைத் துணைத் தலைவர் அவர்களே,

“கடந்த சில மாதங்களாக சர்க்கரை, வெல்லம், கடலை எண்ணெய், பருப்பு வகைகளின் விலைவாசிகள் விஷம்போல் ஏறிக் கொண்டிருப்பதால் ஏழைமக்களும், தொழிலாளர்களும் வெகுவாகப் பாதிக்கப்பட்டுள்ளார்கள். ஆகவே, அத்தியாவசிய உணவுப் பண்டங்களின் விலைகளைக் கட்டுப்படுத்தி, குறைக்க அரசு உடனடியாக நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க வேண்டும்”.

என்கிற அவசரமும் முக்கியமுமான காரியத்தை மாண்புமிகு அமைச்சர் அவர்களின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவருகிறேன்.

The Hon. Thiru K. A. MATHIALAGAN. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member has, in his Call Attention Notice, referred to the rising price trends of sugar, cane jaggery, groundnut oil and pulses.

I shall deal with sugar first. Till February 1967, the quantity that was released by the Government of India for consumption in the Madras State was about 16.100 tonnes per month. Dur-

ing March and April 1967 this was drastically reduced to 11,500 tonnes per month. Between May 1967 and November 1967 this was again further reduced to 9,609 tonnes per month.

The scheme of partial de-control of sugar was introduced by Government of India with effect from 23rd November 1967. According to this revised policy, 60 per cent of the production of sugar in the sugar factories during 1967–68 season will be procured under a scheme of levy and distributed among domest is consumers at a fixed price. The balance of 40 per cent will be available to the sugar factories to be sold anywhere in India at any price. The Government of Madras vehemently opposed this policy of half-way-house. The Chief Minister and I conveyed to the Union Food Minister our emphatic view that the policy of partial de-control will be a short-sighted policy and injurious to the interests of the consumers. However, our objections were overruled and the Government of India persisted in their decision to implement this policy.

Under this revised policy, from December 1967 a quantity of about 6,096 tonnes of sugar per month only has been released by the Government of India for distribution under levy system in this State and about 750 tonnes per month under open market quota. Both these put together account for only about 9,000 tonnes per month. This House appreciate that as against 16,000 tonnes of sugar per month which the State was getting from the Government of India in February 1967 we have now to manage with about half that quantity namely about 9,000 tonnes. The steep and drastic reduction by the Government of India of the sugar available to this State has created considerable difficulties for the State.

A quantity of about 6,000 tonnes per month released under levy distribution is disributed to domestic consumers in the State at a price of Rs. 1.75 per kg. In order to make atleast the minimum quantities available for distribution to domestic card holders, the State Government are making the supplies to bulk consumers from the open market quoa of about 2.750 onnes per month. Altnough in accordance with the policy of the Government of India the open market quota will be available to the sugar factories to be sold anywhere in India at any price, in their anxiety to ensure that at least the whole of these limited quantities are sold within the State at reasonable price, the State Government have, after negotiations with the South India Sugar Mills Association representing all the sugar factories, come to an informal arrangement with them by which this open market sugar will also be taken over by the State Government for supply to the bulk consumers in the State at a fixed price. As a result of this arrangement, the quantity of 2,750 tonnes of sugar per month available under the open market quota is being sold entirely within the State to bulk cosumers at a price of Rs. 3.65 per kg.

1968 பிப்ரவரி 20] [Thiru K. A. Mathialagan]

This House will appreciate that while the prices of open market sugar are ruling very high in other States, it has been possible for this State Government as a result of the understanding reached with the sugar manufacturers to ensure circulatin of the entire quantity of the free market sugar at a reasonable price of Rs. 365 per quintal. This arrangement has been entered into in the first instance for a period of 3 months till the end of February 1968. Government have under consideration a proposal to extend this arrangement for a further period of 3 months.

The above narration of facts will, I a msure, convince the House.

(1) that the total quantities of sugar made available to the State have been drastically cut by the Government of India by about half; and

(2) that as a result of an arrangement entered into purely at the initiative of the State Government, it has been possible to ensure to bulk consumers assured supply at the reasonably low price of Rs. 3.65 per kg.

I shall now deal with prices of Khandasari and Cane Jaggery. The State Government were deeply concerned over the steadily increasing trend in the open market prices of cane jaggery and Khandasari sugar in all parts of Madras State. These high prices also resulted in large scale diversion of sugarcane from the manufacture of sugar to that of cane jaggery and Khandasari and contributed to a substantial short-fall in the production of sugar. This Government were therefore firmly convinced that some emergency measures were necessary to arrest these alarming price trends and accordingly proposed to impose a ban on the transpot of cane jaggery and Khandasari outside the Madras State. Although this Government have been urging the Government of India for the past 9 months to grant their concurrence for imposing such a ban, I am sorry to state that the Government of India have so far not seen their way to give their concurrence. Telegraphic reminders and personal communications from the Food Minister and the Chief Minister to the Union Food Minister have not been of any avail. After several months, the Government of India have sent a reply at the official level stating that in their view the ban would not now be necessary as the prices of these commodities have already come down. Statistics of price trends reveal that there is no basis for the assumption made by the Government of India that prices have come down and that, on the contrary, prices are again tending to go up. It is frustrating to note that under the present system of distribution of powers between the Centre and the States, the State Government do not have even the authority to take such an elementary measure as imposing a ban on the movement of cane jaggery and Khandasari outside the State even when they are firmly convinced that such a decision is essential in the interests of the State.

As the concurrence of the Government of India for the ban was not forthcoming, the State Government issued on 30th October 1967 a direction under sub-clause 2 of clause 4 of the Madras Gur and Khandasari Sugar Dealers Licensing Order, 1963 to the effect that no licensee shall sell cane jaggery or Khandasari sugar to any person outside the district except on permits issued by the Commissioner of Civil Supplies, Madras. The object of this order was not to prohibit movement of cane jaggery and Khandasari from one district to another but only to regulate its sale so as to ensure that a larger quantity circulates within the State and is available to consumers throughout the State at a reasonable price. This Order has now been challenged before the Madras High Court and their judgment is awaited. I am, therefore, not in a position to canvass before the House the merits of this Order. I would, however, like to point out that as a result of this regulatory order passed by the State Government there was a significant fall in the price of jaggery between November 1967 and January 1968. The price of cane jaggery which was Rs. 270 per quintal on 20th October 1967 in Madras City had, as a result of this regulatory order come down to Rs. 180 per quintal as on 1st December 1967. The price of second sort cane jaggery in the city which was Rs. 250 per quintal as on 20th October 1967 had come down to Rs. 160 per quintal as on 1st December 1967. In Vellore, the price of special sort cane jaggery was Rs. 225 per quintal on 20th October 1967 and had come down to Rs. 152.50 per quintal on 1st December 1967. The price of cane jaggery first sort in Coimbatore was Rs. 215.38 on 20th October 1967 but had come down to Rs. 161.53 as on 1st December 1967. Statistics of price trends for all categories of cane jaggery in other districts like Tiruchirappalli and Madurai also reveal the same downward trend.

THIRU K. VINAYAKAM : Sir, on a point of order. As the Hon. Minister has pertinently pointed out, this matter is before the High Court and when the matter is not yet decided by the High Court, is it right on the part of the Hon. Minister to canvass support for the case in his favour by quoting all these figures. This matter is *sub judice* but the Hon. Minister is giving details about the price that was prevailing last year and the price that has come down now due to regulatory orders of this Government. As the matter is pending before the High Court, if the Hon. Minister goes on giving details about the price, it would mean that he is trying to influence the Judiciary to pass judgment in favour of the Government. That is not doing proper justice.

THE HON. THIRU K. A. MATHIALAGAN : Sir, the hon. Member is not carefully following my statement. Now I am just referring to the price trend. The Court cannot interfere with my quoting the price of cane-jaggery in November and December. I am not at all canvassing and I am not at all questioning the validity of the order. I am just putting forth the

view of the Government. This significant decrease in prices is an eloquent testimony to the wisdom of the State Government in having issued a regulatory order. The continuance of this regulatory order will now depend on the orders of the High Court on the Writ Petition challenging these orders. If, for any reason, a situation arises by which these regulatory orders cannot hold the field any longer and if the Government of India still persist in their refusal to give their concurrence to the proposal of the State Government to imposé a ban on the movement of jaggery outside the State, the good work done by the State Government in curbing the price increase will be nullified and the position will once again go out of control. I am sure the seriousness of the situation will not be lost on the Members of the House and that they will endorse this Government's plea for imposing a ban on the movement of jaggery outside the State. In the light of the position explained above, the Members of this House can appreciate that the State Government have been taking all possible efforts to reduce the price of cane jaggery in the face of the none-too-helpful attitute of the Government of India.

This State's position in respect of pulses is not too happy. Madras State is chronoically deficit in respect of Black Gram, Toor and Bengalgram. The local production of Black Gram is only 10,000 tonnes whereas the total requirements of the State are about 60,000 tonnes. The net deficit of 50,000 tonnes has got to be made good mainly by import from other States, Andhra Pradesh being our main source of import. Local production of toor dhall is only 20,000 tonnes while our total requirements are as high as 85,000 tonnes. The net deficit of 65,000 tonnes has to be met by imports mainly from Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan. In respect of Bengalgram, there is no local production worth name and our entire requirements of 1,50,000 tonnes of wholegram and 1,00,000 tonnes of dhall have to be met by imports from other States. Eighty per cent of this is supplied by Punjab and the balance from Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. While we are thus almost totally dependent on the supply of pulses from other States, the difficulty has been aggravated by some surplus States imposing restrictions on the movement of these pulses outside the States. We have been repeatedly impressing on the Government of India that in the overall interests of the country it is essential that the surplus States should not be allowed to take such unilateral action to the detriment of other States and have been requesting the Government of India to pursuade the surplus States remove these restrictions. It is discouraging to note that so far the Government of India have neither been able to persuade the surplus States to remove these restrictions or to make an increased allotment of pulses to Madras State. Here again the earnest efforts taken by the State Government have not so far yielded results for lack of a positive response from the Government of India.

In respect of groundnut oil also this Government have been feeling very strongly that the only effective solution to curb the steadily increasing prices was to ban the export of groundnut and groundnut oil. Here also our efforts for getting the concurrence of the Government of India have not met with success and we have been literally frustrated in our attempts. Thanks however, to larger areas been diverted to groundnut in 1966–67 the production has gone up considerably and the prices of both groundnut kernel and groundut oil now appear to be amenable to some control.

I have sought to take the House into confidence about the measures taken by us to hold down the prices in respect of these important commodities. The State Government are constantly vigilant in taking effective action to hold the price line. It is however galling to note that even in respect of such vital issues affecting the day-to-day life of the people of this State under the present dispensation the State Government have little powers to pursue an imaginative and bold policy. I may, however, assure the Members of this House that notwithstanding these difficulties and irksome annoyances, the State Government will continue their efforts to find a lasting solution for curbing the rising prices.

திரு. கே. வினாயகம் : ஆன் எ பாயின்ட் ஆப் இன்பர்மேஷன் . .

மாண்புமிகு பேரவைத் துணைத் தலைவர் : கவன ஈர்ப்புத் தீர்மானம் யார் கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்களோ, அந்த உறுப்பினருக்கு இரண்டு கேள்விகள் கேட்பதற்கு உரிமை இருக்கிறது.

திரு. கே. வினாயகம் : ஆன் எ பாயின்ட் ஆப் இன்பர்மேஷன் . .

மாண்புமிகு பேரவைத் துணைத் தலைவர் : இது பற்றி விதி இருக்கிறது. அதன்படி, வேண்டுமானால் கவன ஈர்ப்புத் தீர்மானம் கொடுத்த உறுப்பினர் இரண்டு கேள்விகள் கேட்பதற்கு அனுமதிக்கலாம்.

* **திரு. எஸ். இராமச்சந்திரன் :** தலைவரவர்களே, காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி ஆளுகின்ற அண்டை மாநிலங்களிலே மதுவிலக்குக் கொள்கை ரத்துயெப்பட்டு விட்டதால்தான் வெல்லத்தினுடைய விலை ஏறியிருக்கிறது என்று சொல்லப்படுகிறதே, அப்படியானால் எந்த அளவுக்கு வெல்லத்தினுடைய விலை ஏறியிருக்கிறது ? இந்தியா முழுதும் மதுவிலக்குக் கொள்கையை அமலாக்க வேண்டுமென்று இந்த அரசு யோசனை கூறுமா ? பருப்பு அந்த மாநிலத்தால் தடைசெய்யப்பட்டது. நம்முடைய மாநிலத்திலே நாம் தடைப் படுத்துகிறபோதெல்லாம் மத்திய சர்க்காரிடமிருந்து அது பற்றி அனுமதி வரவில்லை, அனுமதி வரவில்லை என்ற நிலைமை இருக்கிறதே இதுபற்றியும் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் தெரிவிப்பார்களா ?

(விடை இல்லை)